

In The Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings, which includes FIGs. 1 and 2, replaces the original sheet including FIGs. 1 and 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 1 page

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action dated August 23, 2010.

Present Status of the Application

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to as including the phrases "discloses" and "comprising."

The title of the invention is objected to as being not descriptive.

FIG.1 is objected to as lacking a legend such as --PRIOR ART--.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being assertedly unpatentable over Kadono et al. (US 7,327,788; hereinafter "Kadono").

After carefully considering the Office Action and the cited references, Applicants have amended the abstract, title, and FIG. 1 to overcome the objections, have amended claims 1 and 3 to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 and 112, and respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 on the following basis. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been entered by way of amendment. Upon entry of the above amendment, Applicants respectfully

submit that all the pending claims 1-3 in proper condition for allowance. Withdrawal of all the objections and rejections and allowance of all the pending claims are earnestly requested.

Response to Objections to the Abstract, Title, and Drawings

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to as including the phrases "discloses" and "comprising."

In response thereto, Applicants have amended the abstract by removing said phrases.

The title of the invention is objected to as being not descriptive.

In response thereto, Applicants have replaced the current title with the title which is suggested by the Office and clearly indicative of the claimed invention.

FIG. 1 is objected to as lacking a legend such as --Prior Art--.

In response thereto, Applicants have amended FIG. 1 to be designated by the legend --PRIOR ART--.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C 101

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention.

In response thereto, Applicants have amended claim 1 to overcome the rejections. Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for obtaining an image reference block **in a picture** in a code mode of fixed reference frame number **in image encoding/decoding of digital video**, so that said method is tied to another statutory category (a picture displayed in a display device) and transforms underlying subject matter (encodes/decodes digital video). Applicants thereby submit that claim 1 and claims 2-3 dependent therefrom all fall within one of the four statutory categories of invention and respectfully requests withdrawal of said rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C 112

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

In response thereto, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 3 to cancel the phrase "possibly," so that it is clear that all the limitations in said claims are parts of the claimed invention, and claims 1-3 thus particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C 103

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being assertedly unpatentable over Kadono

In response thereto, Applicants respectfully traverse said rejections on the grounds set forth in detail below.

Even if Kadono suggests judging whether the first parameter for deriving a motion vector of a current block is a value within a predetermined range, and even if Kadono discloses “a motion vector derivation step of deriving the motion vector of the current block by scaling the reference motion vector based on a predetermined value and the second parameter when the first parameter is not the value within the predetermined range as a result of the judgment in the judgment step, and by scaling the reference motion vector based on the first parameter and the second parameter when the first parameter is the value within the predetermined range as a result of said judgment,” Kadono nevertheless fails to disclose “a maximum forward reference frame which is pointed by the B frame” as claimed in claim 1 of the instant application.

Kadono suggests performing multiplication instead of division for scaling a reference motion vector and also limiting the value of a parameter used for scaling a reference motion vector to a predetermined range to reduce data amount on a multiplier parameter table stored in a memory (paragraph 19). The technical solution provided by Kadono is different from the claimed invention in the following aspects. In one aspect, the predetermined range provided by Kadono is the difference in time information between the forward picture and the backward picture which can be set freely (paragraph 68), but the value that should be compared with the

motion vector disclosed by claim 1 is the maximum forward reference frame which is pointed by the B frame. In another aspect, the aim making use of a predetermined value suggested by Kadono is to reduce the amount of data on a multiplier parameter table stored in a memory, but the aim of discriminating whether the motion vector is beyond a maximum forward reference frame which is pointed by the B frame is to solve the problem that the B frame cannot obtain the image reference block when it is out of the scope so as to guarantee coding efficiency to the largest extent.

Based on the above two aspects, it can be seen that, Kadono fails to disclose “a maximum forward reference frame which is pointed by the B frame,” and fails to disclose how to solve the problem that the B frame cannot obtain the image reference block when it is out of the scope, since Kadono only suggests limiting the value of a parameter used for scaling a reference motion vector to a predetermined range, and there is neither specific evidence nor motivation to obtain the content of claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Kadono and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103. Claims 2-3 should also be allowed as a matter of law due to their dependency upon claim 1.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-3 of the present application patently define over the cited art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS

Date: November 23, 2010

/JIAWEI HUANG/
Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809
Email: jcpi@msn.com